

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1, 4 and 10 are amended, and claims 7-9 are cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Therefore, claims 1-6 and 10-20 are pending. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank Examiner El-Chanti for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives during the October 25 telephone interview. During the interview, proposed amendments to claims 1 and 4 were discussed.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6 and 9-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,343,313 to Salesky et al. (Salesky). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a document translation circuit that converts a format of an original document from a native application format to a standard format. This feature is described in the specification at, for example, page 6, lines 15-26.

The document translation circuit 67 allows different types of devices to discuss the same document by converting a format of the original document to be discussed from a native application format, such as a Word format, to a standard document format, such as rich text format.

Salesky teaches at col. 2, lines 29-49 that the conferencing software captures a portion of the screen display of the presenter and sends the captured region to the conference server. Then the attendee obtains a current view of the captured region from the conference server. As described at col. 7, lines 35-55, In Salesky's device, presenter client 12 takes a periodic "snap-shot" of the application screen image contained within a rectangular boundary determined by the presenter, breaks the screen shot into smaller rectangular blocks, and compares the blocks to information from a previous screen shot. Then, after detecting the difference of the new and old blocks to extract information on the changes, the image in the block is compressed using a publicly available compression algorithm, such as JPEG or PNG,

or licensed proprietary methods of compression. In addition, as described at col. 9, lines 13-35, the conference server transcodes the captured image information of the presenter into a device-independent format for transmission and transcodes back to a device-dependent format for each attendee's screen.

Therefore, Salesky only converts the image captured on the presenter's display, rather than the format of the original document from a native application format to a standard format, as recited in claim 1. As described at col. 16, lines 4-32, in Salesky, as the image of the presenter's display is divided into a number of blocks, only the information of the shared image is transmitted to the client for display.

During the interview, Examiner El-Chanti did not state whether this amendment overcomes the rejection, but indicated that he would reconsider it upon receipt of a formal response.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Salesky. Claims 2, 3 and 10-20 are patentable at least for their dependence on claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Independent claim 4 recites converting a format of an original document to be discussed from a native application format to a standard format. In view of the above discussion regarding claim 1, it is clear that Salesky does not teach, suggest or need converting a format of the document from a native application format to a standard format. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is patentable over Salesky.


Claims 5 and 6 are allowable at least for their dependence on claim 4, as well as for the additional features they recite.

At least for these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen P. Catlin
Registration No. 36,101

JAO:KXH/tbh

Attachments:

Petition for Extension of Time
Request for Continued Examination

Date: December 27, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--